## OVERVIEW

The role of the judge should be to vote for whoever methodologically deconstructs oppression best - extend Bullis/Houde - this specifically says we should use pedagogical spaces to reject oppression, I concede Diganta links with his deconstruction but our framing of the round should include all anti-oppressive discourse

1. Matsuda is a net benefit to this role of the judge because he says all forms of oppression are bad and don't fit under any ethical viewpoint so they’re equally worth fighting.
2. Diganta calls the security state into question in his critique and the pinnacle of islamophobia violence that self replicates throughout the rest of society, the images of violence he points to are true but his methodology will always be comparatively weaker the the negatives because he does not attack or question the root cause of islamophobia and racial oppression: Capitalism.
3. Questions of oppression stem from cap, even if you buy Diganta’s links to the role of the ballot I’m going to outweigh on scale because I call into question the root cause of all oppression.

## LINK/DA - MICROPOL

#### Micropolitical practices can never challenge power because they can never locate it — only an ideological analysis which can trace the places it accumulates can be productive. Žižek, Senior Researcher at the Institute for Social Studies (Ljubljana), 1994 [Slavoj, “Introduction,” *Mapping Ideology*, ed. Žižek, p. 12-14]

2. What follows is the step from 'in-itself to 'for-itself, to ideology in its otherness-externalization: the moment epitomized by the Althusserian notion of Ideological State Apparatuses (ISA) that designate the material existence of ideology in ideological practices, rituals and institutions." Religious belief, for example, is not merely or even primarily an inner conviction, but the Church as an institution and its rituals (prayer, baptism, confirmation, confession . . . ) which, far from being a mere secondary externalization of the inner belief, stand for the very mechanisms that generate it. When Althusser repeats, after Pascal: `Act as if you believe, pray, kneel down, and you shall believe, faith will arrive by itself , he delineates an intricate reflective mechanism of retroactive 'autopoetic' foundation that far exceeds the reductionist assertion of the dependence of inner belief on external behaviour. That is to say, the implicit logic of his argument is: kneel down and you shall believe that you knelt down because of your belief — that is, your following the ritual is an expression/effect of your inner belief; in short, the 'external' ritual performatively generates its own ideological foundation.' What we encounter here again is the 'regression' into ideology at the very point where we apparently step out of it. In this respect, the relationship between Althusser and Foucault is of special interest. The Foucauldian counterparts to Ideological State Apparatuses are the disciplinary procedures that operate at the level of 'micro-power' and designate the point at which power inscribes itself into the body directly, bypassing ideology — for that precise reason, Foucault never uses the term 'ideology' apropos of these mechanisms of micro-power. This abandoning of the problematic of ideology entails a fatal weakness of Foucault's theory. Foucault never tires of repeating how power constitutes itself 'from below', how it does not emanate from some unique summit: this very semblance of a Summit (the Monarch or some other embodiment of Sovereignty) emerges as the secondary effect of the plurality of micro-practices, of the complex network of their interrelations. However, when he is compelled to display the concrete mechanism of this emergence, Foucault resorts to the extremely suspect rhetoric of complexity, evoking the intricate network of lateral links, left and right, up and down . . . a clear case of patching up, since one can never arrive at Power this way — **the abyss that separates micro-procedures from the spectre of Power remains unbridgeable.**

The way Diganta specifically says we can’t locate the deriving factors of Islamophobia is bad to his movement, even if it comes from a variety of socio-economic-political sources, it’s valuable to isolate the largest projectable source and start the movement there.

This also means the perm always fails because if he says aff first, then alt, the aff never ends because it’s an inefficient movement so he can never access the alt.

## LINK-ISLAMOPHOBIA

## Islamaphobia is rooted in the system of capitalism—this rhetoric is used to cover the need of a transformation of the economy

**Ahmed 2010** (Nafeez Mosaddeq, 14 september, “Understanding Islamophobia”, <http://www.newleftproject.org/index.php/site/article_comments/understanding_islamophobia/>, Executive Director of the Institute for Policy Research and Development in London and has taught at the University of Sussex and Brunel University.)

I think it’s a very complex thing. The obvious thing is the occurrence of terrorist attacks. Its clear there has been a spike in hostility towards Muslims after the acts of 9/11 and 7/7. The question of course is whether it is a rational response to the attacks. What is of concern is the way the state frames the most rational response and the way it tries to understand and convey the narrative around these attacks.  Often the state singles out Muslim communities for surveillance, in terms of them being threatening. That very symptom-led response feeds into the media. There’s very little critical questioning about the government’s responses, or about foreign policy, our intelligence policies or our security measures. This leaves the public with a very simple narrative: “there are these Muslims who hate our way of life.” At the same time, even while Muslim communities are securitized wholesale, governments often attempt to absolve themselves of blame by making banal public declaration that they believe most Muslims are good and don’t endorse terrorism, and that Islam itself does not endorse terrorism. But such PR efforts are not commensurate with the actual state-intelligence or military response, which still disproportionately targets Muslim communities, and which in turn fuels the media’s demonization of them as a perpetual source of threat. It turns into this vicious cycle which misinforms most people who probably haven’t had many interactions with many Muslims. **Their only interaction with a Muslim will be through their television screen** or through what they hear on the radio, or what they read in The Sun. So that’s the problem, is that the first bit of information they’re getting about Muslims is that they’ve committed a terrorist attack, and there is a danger, and they have these dangerous beliefs, and there’s Bin laden and Al Qaeda, and they’re here in this country, there’s 2,000 Muslims ready to attack. That’s all the public are hearing, they’re not hearing anything else. So it feeds into that sense of fear and anxiety. It’s very easy then to look at Muslims and pick on the stereotypes. I think the other thing is these **deeper structural issues** at play. **I see the economic crisis as symptomatic of a fundamental** breakdown of the neoliberal **global** economy**.** We’re facing climate change, energy depletion, food crises, and economic recessions. On the back of that, we’ve also got these escalating fears of security, terrorism and violent conflict. So all of these things are converging at the same time, and it’s established that **when you have ample social crisis, that** generates anxieties, social groups **often** tend to construct ‘others’**; they ‘otherise’ communities**. Whereas previously you may have had a very cohesive community, suddenly it becomes easy to pinpoint a group of others and mark them out as different, and project ‘blame’ for our social ills on to this now ‘excluded’ group. There is now a so-called ‘clash of civilisations’ where we see Muslims being blamed. **Instead of thinking about a big transformation of the economy, there is this knee-jerk tendency to say the problem is concerning Muslims.** For example, one of the reasons **we are in Iraq and have an interventionist foreign policy is an over-dependency ON oil**. Rather than looking at that, people will be talking about how these Muslims are attacking us – this ‘otherisation’ process. I think all of these things combine to create a very strong vortex of a form of radicalisation, where a majority host-community starts becoming radicalised and has very very dangerous ideas about its minority communities.

## Identity can only be found by first looking through the lens of capitalism—focusing on the state and race relations renaturalizes capitalism and allows for more suffering

**Brown 93**

[Wendy, “Wounded Attachments”, Political Theory, Aug. p. 392-394//wyo-tjc]

As liberal discourse converts political identity into essentialized private interest, disciplinary power converts interest into normativized social identity manageable by regulatory regimes. Thus **disciplinary power politically neutralizes entitlement claims generated by liberal individuation, whereas liberalism politically neutralizes rights claims generated by disciplinary identities.** In addition to the formations of identity that may be the complex effects of disciplinary and liberal modalities of power, I want to suggest one other historical strand relevant to the production of politicized identity, this one hewn more specifically to recent developments in political culture. Although sanguine to varying degrees about the phenomenon they are describing, many on the European and North American Left have argued that identity politics emerges from the demise of class politics consequent to post-Fordism or pursuant to May 1968. Without adjudicating the precise relationship between the breakup of class politics and the proliferation of other sites of political identification, I want to refigure this claim by suggesting that **what we have come to call identity politics is** partly **dependent on the demise of a critique of capitalism** and of bourgeois cultural and economic values. In a reading that links the new identity claims to a certain relegitimation of capitalism, **identity politics concerned with race, sexuality, and gender will appear not as a supplement to class politics, not as an expansion of Left categories of oppression and emancipation**, not as an enriching complexification of pro- gressive formulations of power and persons-all of which they also are-**but as tethered to a formulation of justice which, ironically, reinscribes a bourgeois ideal as its measure**. If it is this ideal that signifies educational and vocational opportunity, upward mobility, relative protection against arbitrary violence, and reward in proportion to effort, and **if it is this ideal against which many of the exclusions and privations of people** of color, gays and lesbians, and women are articulated, **then the political purchase of contemporary American identity politics would** seem to **be achieved** in part **through a** certain discursive **renaturalization of capitalism** that can be said to have marked progressive discourse since the 1970s. What this suggests is that identity politics may be partly configured by a peculiarly shaped and peculiarly disguised form of resentment-class resent- ment without class consciousness or class analysis. This resentment is displaced onto discourses of injustice other than class but, like all resent- ments, retains the real or imagined holdings of its reviled subject-in this case, bourgeois male privileges-as objects of desire. From this perspective, it would appear that the articulation of politicized identities through race, gender, and sexuality require, rather than incidentally produce, a relatively limited identification through class. They necessarily rather than incidentally abjure a critique of class power and class norms precisely because the injuries suffered by these identities are measured by bourgeois norms of social acceptance, legal protection, relative material comfort, and social indepen- dence. The problem is that **when not only economic stratification but other injuries to body and psyche enacted by capitalism** (alienation, cornmodifica- tion, exploitation, displacement, disintegration of sustaining, albeit contra- dictory, social forms such as families and neighborhoods) **are discursively normalized and thus depoliticized, other markers of social difference may come to bear an inordinate weight. Absent an articulation of capitalism in the political discourse of identity, the marked identity bears all the weight of the sufferings produced by capitalism in addition to that bound to the explicitly politicized marking.**

And capitalism creates the class system of peoples which is the basis of the modern apparatus in which violence to marginalized groups is guaranteed to ensure capitalist domination – the impact is constant war, oppression, and exploitation in all forms. **Myers 9[[1]](#footnote-1):**

Capitalism is a system based on exploitation. For Marxists, this has a precise scientific meaning. Capitalists take for themselves the monetary values created by or belonging to other people — usually workers, but also small farmers and, to varying degrees, small shop owners and nominally independent tradespeople. This value is what their capital consists of. But exploitation does not exhaust the harmful effects that capitalism has on the rest of the world. **Capitalist society also invents many forms of oppression, as well as perpetuating many inherited from earlier forms of social organisation.** Oppression is the systematic imposition of inferior conditions of life on particular groups of people. Members of an oppressed group may be discriminated against economically, socially and/or politically. Sometimes oppression has an economic impact; in some way, it increases the capitalists’ ability to exploit. **An obvious example is discrimination against women or against a national or racial minority. The victims of such discrimination often receive lower wages than other workers, so this oppression adds directly to capitalists’ profits. Capitalists gain a slightly more indirect economic benefit from militarism and war**. **Two world wars in the 20th century occurred primarily because the capitalists of the major imperialist countries were competing for colonies and semi-colonies, to monopolise the profits from them.** Today capitalists are risking making the planet uninhabitable for much of the human race because behaving differently might reduce their profits. Political motives Capitalism also maintains oppressions in which profits are at most a very secondary consideration. The economic benefits that capitalists seek from war and militarism are less significant than their political role. The military forces maintained by imperialist countries like Australia are an ever present threat to the peoples of the underdeveloped countries: “Step too far out of line, don’t do as you’re told, and you’ll have a fight on your hands (in which we hold all the weapons)”. These forces are also the ultimate guarantee of capitalists’ power in their own country: that is, they are intended for use against their own working people if they get too far “out of line”. **Capitalists have to maintain a variety of oppressions because they are a very small minority** **in any society. If the exploited majority were to act together** to put an end to exploitation, **they could very easily overcome the capitalists**. For this reason, the capitalists have a very strong vested interest in preventing the exploited majority from getting used to the idea of working together — on almost anything. **Oppression has a political function for capitalism if it sets one section of the exploited against another section. Male union members who think that a woman’s “real” place is at home won’t build a strong union**. Parents who are concerned about their children going to school with immigrant children won’t be raising demands on the government to provide better education for everyone. People who think that a neighbouring country’s religion is dangerous to them won’t resist their own government’s militarism. Solidarity Socialism is about human liberation: from exploitation, and from all forms of oppression. There is a parody view — sometimes held by some socialists — that socialists therefore believe that victims of oppression should put off the struggle for their own liberation until “after the revolution”, at which point the new socialist government will put everything right. Such an attitude misses the essential point: we will never escape capitalism without uniting in action the great majority of the working people, who are now mostly disunited and often at loggerheads with each other because of discrimination and oppression. So fighting for socialism necessarily means fighting to help the oppressed overcome their oppression now, not in some distant future. This is the meaning of “solidarity”: “We are with you because your future is also our future”. Anything else allows the capitalists to continue keeping us divided and unable to consistently confront our real enemy: them.

**The alternative is to reject the aff to problematize capitalism. Applying critical globalization studies to local arenas reveals the inter-workings of power and creates movements against them**

**Robinson 06** Professor of Sociology at the University of California, Santa Barbara (William I., Critical Globalization Studies, Chapter 2, “Critical Globalization Studies”, ed by R Richard P Appelbaum, http://www.soc.ucsb.edu/faculty/robinson/Assets/pdf/crit\_glob.pdf SW)

CGS = critical globalization studies

In the tradition of critical studies, a CGS is subversive insofar as it explicitly seeks to replace predominant power structures and social hierarchies with what are seen as more just and equitable social arrangements. A CGS involves exposing the ideological content of theories and knowledge claims often put forward as social scientiﬁc discourse, the vested interests before the façade of neutral scholarship, and how powerful institutions really work. This means challenging the dominant mythologies of our age, such as that ecologically sound development is possible under capitalism, that ‘‘democracy’’ exists where tiny minorities control wealth and power, or that we are moving toward an ‘‘ownership society’’ when in fact we live in a usurped society in which the lot of the majority is one of increasing dispossession. In this sense, a CGS is a counterhegemonic practice that seeks to rebuild public discourse by ‘‘speaking truth to power.’’ It involves making visible and unmasking power relations in our institutions and professional associations, in our locales and in the larger— ultimately global—society. While the substantive agenda of a CGS must be open, the underlying enterprise involves applying our training and experience to elucidating the real inner workings of the social order and the contradictions therein. This must include putting forward a cogent and systematic critique of global capitalism that exposes injustices, makes invisible problems visible, and reveals pressure points in the system. Rendering visible what Paul Farmer (2003) terms the ‘‘pathologies of power’’ means ‘‘bearing witness,’’ but more than that it means showing how suffering is a consequence of the structural violence that is immanent to the prevailing system and that links together apparently disconnected aspects of that system. We should recall, in this regard, Sartre’s admonition, in his ‘‘A Plea for Intellectuals,’’ that ‘‘the exploited classes do not need an ideology so much as the practical truth of society; they need knowledge of the world in order to change it’’ (1974). As regards a CGS, we would do well to follow Susan George’s advice to study not so much the oppressed as the powerful: Those that genuinely want to help the movement should study the rich and powerful, not the poor and powerless. Although wealth and power are in a better position to hide their activities and are therefore more difﬁcult to study, any knowledge about them will be valuable to the movement.

The alt is also a DA to the case, by not engaging in switch side debate he refuses to take on the epistemology of the capitalist and thus refuses to contribute the kind of subversive ideology necessary for an effective anti-cap movement.

This also turns Bhambra, the epistemology of anticap is best to solve for issues of oppression but Robinson is clear on the matter that understanding oppressive epistemology from the perspective of the oppressor is k2 effective movements so he can never perm the alt.

I outweigh on a few levels:

Cap answers all issues of oppression and thus has 100% strength of link to the role of the ballot whereas he can only speak to a subset so even if he wins the aff I outweigh on scale

He has no solvency - Zizek is pretty clear on how to fight oppression we need to isolate single sources or else were shooting into the dark, so even if he has a risk of offense my clear methodology is comparatively better.

1. Myers, Allen. “Why capitalism needs oppression.” Direct Action for Socialism in the 21st Century. September 15th, 2009. Accessed 12/25/14. http://directaction.org.au/issue15/why\_capitalism\_needs\_oppression [↑](#footnote-ref-1)